From:	Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	Robert Gensemer; Carrie Smith; Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Jay.Field@noaa.gov; Jim Koloszar; Margaret Spence; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov
Subject:	NOAA FTP site access.
Date:	01/11/2007 02:23 PM

Hey All-

I posted the updated Portland Harbor watershed database and mapping project on the private side of our NOAA ftp site under the folder /PortlandHarbor2. This is also the location that we're using for management/sharing of analyses for the Round 2 data review.

A username and password are required to log in (both are part of the following link, which should work if copied/pasted into IE or other

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

You may have to adjust your IE settings to "Use passive ftp". There may also be some firewall settings that necessitate calling up tech staff.

Or you could use some 3rd party FTP client...

I'll send out a more formal write-up soon.

Ben

----- Original Message -----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 6:57 pm
Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table

> I think we are set for a call on Thursday at 1:00 pm. Note this is
> riday (the call-in number is
> Non-Responsive). Jay, I hope you can
>
> I am attaching an updated table (again). Jim and I have resolved his
> table and this one. We have incorporated the mercury TMDL number and
> the changes identified by Ben. Note however, that the numbers for
> hexachlorobutadiene, PCE and TCE are correct. We did not change the
> units.
>
> For most of the chemicals on the table, we should be able to
> extract the
> data directly out of QM. However, there are a few chemicals that we
> need to make some decisions about how to handle because they are
> not in
> QM. These chemicals are highlighted in brown on my table. I would
> like to continue our efforts on every chemical but the brown
> highlighedchemicals.
>
> The chemcials we need to spend more time on include:
>
> Total DDE (sum of two isomers) - HH and Eco
> Total DDD (sum of two isomers) - HH and Eco
> Total DDT (sum of two isomers) - HH and Eco
> Carcinogenic PAHs (HH only)
> Non-Carcinogenic PAHs (HH only)
> 2,3,7,9-TCDD TEQ (dioxin like PCB congners and total of TEQ dioxin and
> dioxin like PCBs) - HH and eco
> Total Chlordane
>
> I have come up with a proposal for PAHs (looking at high molecular
> weight and low molecular weight PAHs as a surrogate for
> carcinogenic and
> non-carcinogenic but it is not a good match). We can not use tech
> chlordane for total chlordane because we only have handful of chemcial
> analyses so we will need to sum in excel.
>
> Anyway, look forward to talking tomorrow.
>
> Eric
> (See attached file: RiskParameters011007.xls)
>
>
>
>
> Robert Gensemer
>
> <rgensemer@param
>
> etrix.com>
> To
> Eric
> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> 01/10/2007 04:14 Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov
>
> PM
> cc
> Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

> Jay.Field@noaa.gov,
> Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, Carrie
> Smith
> <csmith@parametrix.com>,
> Jim Koloszar
> <jkoloszar@parametrix.com>,
> Margaret Spence
> <mspence@parametrix.com>
> Subject
> Re: A few modifications to
> the
> table

> I think we need to be as consistent with QM as possible in terms of
> numbers and units. Lets not get too concerned about cleaning up every
> aspect of the risk parameters table to be a perfect match with QM,
> though. Remember this is a guide of analyses to do and a
> compliation of
> screening values, not necessarily a formal spreadsheet work template
> (unless you guys have decided to do so??). Thanks to all,
> -Bob
>
> **
> Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
> Parametrix, Inc.
> 33972 Texas Street SW
> Albany, OR 97321
> T 541-791-1667, x-6510
> F 541-791-1699
> C 541-760-1511
> rgensemer@parametrix.com
> **
>
> >>> <Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov> 1/10/2007 7:36:38 AM >>>
> Eric-
>
> A few notes on the surface sediment screening numbers for ecological
> risk:
>
> I strongly recommend that the units that are in this spreadsheet be
> changed to reflect the units in Query Manager. There should be a
> columnwith the units for each analyte (most metals in PPM,
> vols/svols etc
> PPB), and the guidelines should be adjusted to that for consistency.
>
> Total PCB's TEC should probably be .0598 (off by 10^3)
>
> Dieldrin (PPB) numbers are TEC/PEC = 1.9/61.8; spreadsheet has
> 2.85/6.7
> 2378 TCDD- there is one sample over 9 ng/kg (9E^-6 mg/kg) at 111 under
> railroad bridge. Looking directly at TCDD2378 conc. may benefit
> from a
> paired number.
>
> Hexachlorocyclohexane differs from QM TEC/PEC which is 2.37/4.99 PPB,
> spreadsheet has .94/1.38
>
> Hexachlorobutadiene, Tetrachloroethene, Trichloroethene units may be
> incorrect in spreadsheet (off by 10^3)
>
> Please let me know if there is a call today that I can join- otherwise
> I'm available for the 1pm call tomorrow.
> Thanks,
> Ben
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> Date: Tuesday, January 9, 2007 3:05 pm
> Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table
>
> > Dana, here is a response to your questions and modifications to the
> > table. I am copying the data evaluation folks and attaching your
> > modifications to the table. I also have a few questions for Ben
> > regarding how QM handles certain summed values.
> >
> > I do not want to look at aluminum. 7600 mg/kg while screening in
> > at a

> > HQ of 0.1 is probably below background - upstream aluminum
> > concentrations range from 12,000 - 33,000 mg/kg. Further, the
> direct> contact exposure scenarios are very conservative (350 days
> a year
> > for a
> > beach?).
> >
> > Regarding the TEQs and DDT, DDE and DDD sums - by manually, I meant
> > thatit was not being calculated automatically by Query Manager. We
> > shouldbe able to do this in excel. I certainly support looking at
> > the TEQs
> > but I want to get started on some easier evaluations first. We may
> > haveto prioritize things here.
> >
> > Ben: What is included in the reported TEQ value - dioxin TEQs or
> > dioxinand dioxin-like PCB TEQ?
> >
> > I don't really know how to best evaluate the PAHs.   Regarding
> > naphthalene and Benzo(a)pyrene, we can look at these as individual
> > chemicals. Hopefully,if we look at total PAHs, total low molecular
> > weight PAHs and BAP and naphthalene, we will get a sense of the PAH
> > distribution to help us focus our evaluation. Another thing we
> might> want to do is query the carcinogenic PAHs and look at total
> > carcinogenicPAHs screened against BAP screening numbers.
> >
> > Ben: Do you know high molecular weight and low molecular weight
> PAHs> are calculated.
> >
> > Regarding the modified table. I am ok with screening non-
> > carcinogens at
> > 0.1 (with the exception of Aluminum). Because QM is good at
> > looking at
> > concentration ranges, we should look at both HQ = 1 and HQ = 0.1.
> >
> > I noticed the error regarding the residential soil PRG for BAP
> (units> problem). You have correctly modified the screening number
> to be
> > 0.062mg/kg.
> >
> > Lets figure out the best way to too look at total PCBs (total
> aroclors> or total congeners). For surface water, we should look
> at total
> > congeners due to interferences associated with the aroclor results.
> > For
> > sediment, we should look at both total congeners and total arocIors.
> > The total congeners represents a better number. However, we have
> much> less congener data than aroclor data.   (PMX and Ben, I am
> > attaching a
> > write up on summing).
> >
> > Regarding TBT in Fish, our TBT data is limited to clams, and
> juvenile> Chinook. Only one sample (a clam sample from the
> shipyard) exceeds
> > thefish screening value (detected concentration = 530 ug/kg; fish
> > screeningnumber = 144 ug/kg; shellfish screening number = 1170
> > ug/kg). We can
> > still look at TBT in surface water.
> >
> > Eric
> >
> > (See attached file: 20070108Davoli Modif to ERIC
> > RiskParameters.xls)(Seeattached file: 20060201 Kissinger Approach
> > Portland Harbor Upstream Fish
> > Tissue Sample Total PCBs, PCB TEQs, Dioxin_Furan TEQs.doc)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >   danadavoli
> >
> >   <danadavoli@avva
> >
> >   nta.com>
> > To
> >   Eric
> > Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> >   01/08/2007 09:44
> > cc
> >   PM   Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> >
> >
> > Subject
> >   A few modifications to the
> > table
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > I just checked the HH table. Changes are in yellow.

> >
> >
> > The major changes are HQ=1.0 to HQ=0.1 for the direct contact. I
> added> AL back in for the beaches because it screens in at HQ =
> 0.1. I don't
> > have the LWG website so I couldn't check if AL screens in for the
> > in-water sediments.
> >
> >
> > I think we only have Aroclors for the beaches, not congeners. I
> > startedto add all of the TEQs that I would like to see (d/f, PCB,
> > and the sum
> > of these) to the lists but decided to wait until we talk. I don't
> > thinkit would be that hard for Parametrix to do the calculations in
> > EXCEL or
> > ACCESS and import them into the NOAA database. Same for total PCBs
> > fromcongeners and the DDEs, DDDs, and DDTs.None of this should be
> done> manually.
> >
> >
> > For PAH, I do not know how the NOAA database defines hi MW versus
> > low MW
> > PAHs so I can't tell how close the hi MW would be to the
> carcinogenic> PAHs (B(a)P equivalents.)
> >
> > Wasn't sure what you meant by using naphthalene and B(a)P as
> > surrogates.For example, do you mean using he naphthalene tox values
> > as surrogates
> > for total low MW PAHs?
> >
> >
> > I wasn't sure if TBT is above the SLV in fish. We can use the CRITFC
> > Report value of 500 ug/mg as an SLV for all biota for lead but I
> don't> know if we exceed this. For Hg in water, let's ues the ODEQ
> TMDL> value.Ican look it up tomorrow.
> >
> >
> > I am in Health and Safety training on Tuesday but will try to
> call you
> > at the morning break to discuss the table.
> >
> >